

Vilkovisky-DeWitt Effective Potential and the Higgs-Mass Bound

Guey-Lin Lin and Tzuu-Kang Chyi

Institute of Physics, National Chiao-Tung University, Hsinchu, Taiwan, R.O.C.
E-mail: glin@cc.nctu.edu.tw

We compute the Vilkovisky-DeWitt effective potential of a simplified version of the Standard Electroweak Model, where all charged boson fields as well as the bottom-quark field are neglected. The effective potential obtained in this formalism is gauge-independent. We derive from the effective potential the mass bound of the Higgs boson. The result is compared to its counterpart obtained from the ordinary effective potential.

1 Introduction

The gauge dependence of the effective potential was first pointed out by Jackiw in early seventies¹. This finding raised concerns on the physical significance of the effective potential. In a later work by Dolan and Jackiw², the effective potential of scalar QED was calculated in a set of R_ξ gauges. It was concluded that only the limiting unitary gauge gives sensible result on spontaneous symmetry-breaking. This difficulty was partially resolved by the work of Nielsen³. In his paper, Nielsen derived a simple identity characterizing the mean-field and the gauge-fixing-parameter dependences of the effective potential, namely,

$$(\xi \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} + C(\phi, \xi) \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}) V(\phi, \xi) = 0, \quad (1)$$

where ξ is the parameter appearing in the gauge-fixing term $L_{gf} = -\frac{1}{2\xi}(\partial_\mu A^\mu)^2$. The above identity implies that the local extrema of V for different ξ are located along the same characteristic curve on (ϕ, ξ) plane, which satisfies $d\xi = \frac{d\phi}{C(\phi, \xi)/\xi}$. Hence covariant gauges with different ξ are equally good for computing V . On the other hand, a choice of the multi-parameter gauge² $L_{gf} = -\frac{1}{2\xi}(\partial_\mu A^\mu + \sigma\phi_1 + \rho\phi_2)^2$ would break the homogeneity of Eq. (1)³. Hence effective potential calculated in this gauge has no physical significance.

Recently it was pointed out¹¹ that the Higgs mass bound as derived from the effective potential is gauge-dependent. The gauge dependence enters in the calculation of one-loop effective potential, a quantity that is crucial for the determination of the Higgs mass bound. Boyanovsky, Loinaz and Willey has proposed a resolution⁴ to the gauge dependence of the Higgs mass bound. Their approach is based upon the *Physical Effective Potential* constructed as the expectation value of the Hamiltonian in physical states⁵. The effective potential of the abelian Higgs model is computed explicitly as an illustration. However, this formalism requires the identification of first-class constraints in the theory and a projection to the physical states. Such a procedure necessarily breaks

the manifest Lorentz invariance of the theory. Consequently we expect it is highly non-trivial to apply this formalism to the Standard Model(SM).

In our work⁶, we introduce the formalism of Vilkovisky and DeWitt^{7,8} for constructing an gauge-independent effective potential, and therefore obtaining a gauge-independent lower bound for the Higgs mass. We present the idea with a toy model¹³ which corresponds to neglect all charged boson fields in the SM. The generalization to the full SM is straightforward. In fact, the applicability of Vilkovisky-DeWitt formulation to non-abelian gauge theories has been extensively demonstrated in literatures¹².

The outline of this presentation is as follows. In Section 2, we briefly review the formalism of Vilkovisky and DeWitt using scalar QED as an example. We shall illustrate that the effective action of Vilkovisky and DeWitt is equivalent to the ordinary effective action constructed in the Landau-DeWitt gauge¹⁴. In Section 3, we calculate the effective potential of the simplified standard model, and the relevant renormalization constants of the theory using the Landau-DeWitt gauge. The effective potential is then extended to large vacuum expectation value of the scalar field by means of renormalization group analyses. In Section 4, the mass bound of the Higgs boson is derived and compared to that given by ordinary effective action. Section 5 is the conclusion.

2 Vilkovisky-DeWitt Effective Action of Scalar QED

The formulation of Vilkovisky-DeWitt effective action is motivated by the parametrization dependence of the ordinary effective action, which can be written generically as

$$\begin{aligned} \exp \frac{i}{\hbar} \Gamma[\Phi] &= \exp \frac{i}{\hbar} (W[j] + \Phi^i \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \Phi^i}) \\ &= \int [D\phi] \exp \frac{i}{\hbar} (S[\phi] + (\Phi^i - \phi^i) \cdot \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \Phi^i}). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The parametrization dependence of the ordinary effective action arises because the difference $\eta^i \equiv (\Phi^i - \phi^i)$ is

not a vector in the field configuration space, hence the product $\eta^i \cdot \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \Phi^i}$ is not a scalar under reparametrization. The remedy to this problem is to replace $-\eta^i$ with a two-point function $\sigma^i(\Phi, \phi)$ ^{7,8,9} which, at the point Φ , is tangent to the geodesic connecting Φ and ϕ . The precise form of $\sigma^i(\Phi, \phi)$ depends on the connection Γ_{jk}^i of the configuration space. It is easy to show that¹⁰

$$\sigma^i(\Phi, \phi) = -\eta^i - \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{jk}^i \eta^j \eta^k + O(\eta^3). \quad (3)$$

For scalar QED described by the Lagrangian:

$$L = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + (D_\mu\phi)^\dagger(D^\mu\phi) - \lambda(\phi^\dagger\phi - \mu^2)^2, \quad (4)$$

with $D_\mu = \partial_\mu + ieA_\mu$ and $\phi = \frac{\phi_1 + i\phi_2}{\sqrt{2}}$, we have

$$\Gamma_{jk}^i = \left\{ \begin{matrix} i \\ jk \end{matrix} \right\} + T_{jk}^i, \quad (5)$$

where $\left\{ \begin{matrix} i \\ jk \end{matrix} \right\}$ is the Christoffel symbol of the field configuration space which has the following metric:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\phi_a(x)\phi_b(y)} &= \delta_{ab}\delta^4(x-y), \\ G_{A_\mu(x)A_\nu(y)} &= -g^{\mu\nu}\delta^4(x-y), \\ G_{A_\mu(x)\phi_a(y)} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We note that the metric of the field configuration space is determined by the quadratic part of the Lagrangian according to the prescription of Vilkovisky⁷. In the above flat-metric, we have $\left\{ \begin{matrix} i \\ jk \end{matrix} \right\} = 0$. However, the Christoffel symbols would be non-vanishing in the parametrization with polar variables ρ and χ such that $\phi_1 = \rho \cos \chi$ and $\phi_2 = \rho \sin \chi$. T_{jk}^i is a quantity pertinent to generators g_α^i of the gauge transformation. Explicitly, we have^{7,10}

$$T_{jk}^i = -B_j^\alpha D_k g_\alpha^i + \frac{1}{2}g_\alpha^\rho D_\rho K_\beta^i B_j^\alpha B_k^\beta + j \leftrightarrow k, \quad (7)$$

where $B_k^\alpha = N^{\alpha\beta}g_{k\beta}$ with $N^{\alpha\beta}$ being the inverse of $N_{\alpha\beta} \equiv g_\alpha^k g_\beta^l G_{kl}$. In scalar QED, the generators g_α^i are given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_y^{\phi_a(x)} &= -\epsilon^{ab}\phi_b(x)\delta^4(x-y), \\ g_y^{A_\mu(x)} &= -\partial_\mu\delta^4(x-y). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with $\epsilon^{12} = 1$. The one-loop effective action of scalar QED can be calculated from Eq. (2) with the quantum fluctuations η^i replaced by $\sigma^i(\Phi, \phi)$. The result is written as¹⁰:

$$\Gamma[\Phi] = S[\Phi] - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \ln \det G + \frac{i\hbar}{2} \ln \det \tilde{D}_{ij}^{-1}, \quad (9)$$

where $S[\Phi]$ is the tree-level effective action; $\ln \det G$ arises from the function space measure $[D\phi] \equiv$

$\prod_x d\phi(x)\sqrt{\det G}$, and $\tilde{D}_{ij}^{-1}$ is the modified inverse-propagator:

$$\tilde{D}_{ij}^{-1} = \frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta \Phi^i \delta \Phi^j} - \Gamma_{ij}^k[\Phi] \frac{\delta S}{\delta \Phi^k}. \quad (10)$$

To study the symmetry-breaking behaviour of the theory, we focus on the effective potential which can be obtained from $\Gamma[\Phi]$ by setting the classical fields Φ 's to constants.

The Vilkovisky-DeWitt effective potential of scalar QED has been calculated in various gauges and different parametrizations of scalar fields^{14,10,15}. The results all agree with one another. In this work, we calculate the effective potential and other relevant quantities in Landau-DeWitt gauge¹⁶, which is characterized by the gauge-fixing term: $L_{gf} = -\frac{1}{2\xi}(\partial_\mu B^\mu - ie\eta^\dagger\Phi + ie\Phi^\dagger\eta)^2$, with $\xi \rightarrow 0$. In L_{gf} , $B^\mu \equiv A^\mu - A_{cl}^\mu$, and $\eta \equiv \phi - \Phi$ are quantum fluctuations while A_{cl}^μ and Φ are classical fields. The advantage of performing calculations in the Landau-DeWitt gauge is that T_{jk}^i vanishes¹⁴ in this case. In other words, Vilkovisky-DeWitt formalism coincides with the conventional one in the Landau-DeWitt gauge.

For computing the effective potential, we choose $A_{cl}^\mu = 0$ and $\Phi = \frac{\rho_{cl}}{\sqrt{2}}$, i.e. the imaginary part of Φ is set to zero. In this set of background fields, L_{gf} can be written as

$$L_{gf} = -\frac{1}{2\xi}(\partial_\mu B^\mu \partial_\nu B^\nu - 2e\rho_{cl}\chi \partial_\mu B^\mu + e^2\rho_{cl}^2\chi^2), \quad (11)$$

where χ is the quantum field defined by $\eta = \frac{\rho+i\chi}{\sqrt{2}}$. We note that $B_\mu - \chi$ mixing in L_{gf} is ξ dependent, and therefore would not cancel out the corresponding mixing term in the classical Lagrangian of Eq. (4). This induces the mixed-propagator such as $\langle 0|T(A_\mu(x)\chi(y))|0 \rangle$ or $\langle 0|T(\chi(x)A_\mu(y))|0 \rangle$. The Faddeev-Popov ghost Lagrangian is given by

$$L_{FP} = \omega^*(-\partial^2 - e^2\rho_{cl}^2)\omega. \quad (12)$$

With each part of the Lagrangian determined, we are ready to compute the effective potential. Since we choose a flat-metric, the one-loop effective potential is completely determined by the modified inverse propagators $\tilde{D}_{ij}^{-1}$ ⁷. From Eqs. (4), (11) and (12), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}_{B_\mu B_\nu}^{-1} &= (-k^2 + e^2\rho_0^2)g^{\mu\nu} + (1 - \frac{1}{\xi})k^\mu k^\nu, \\ \tilde{D}_{B_\mu \chi}^{-1} &= ik^\mu e\rho_0(1 - \frac{1}{\xi}), \\ \tilde{D}_{\chi\chi}^{-1} &= (k^2 - m_G^2 - \frac{1}{\xi}e^2\rho_0^2), \\ \tilde{D}_{\rho\rho}^{-1} &= (k^2 - m_H^2), \\ \tilde{D}_{\omega^*\omega}^{-1} &= (k^2 - e^2\rho_0^2)^{-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where we have set $\rho_{cl} = \rho_0$, which is a space-time independent constant, and defined $m_G^2 = \lambda(\rho_0^2 - 2\mu^2)$, $m_H^2 = \lambda(3\rho_0^2 - 2\mu^2)$. Using the definition $\Gamma[\rho_0] = (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(0) V_{eff}(\rho_0)$ along with Eqs. (9) and (13), and taking the limit $\xi \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $V_{eff}(\rho_0) = V_{tree}(\rho_0) + V_{1-loop}(\rho_0)$ with

$$V_{1-loop}(\rho_0) = \frac{-i\hbar}{2} \int \frac{d^n k}{(2\pi)^n} \ln[(k^2 - e^2 \rho_0^2)^{n-3} \times (k^2 - m_H^2)(k^2 - m_+^2)(k^2 - m_-^2)], \quad (14)$$

where m_+^2 and m_-^2 are solutions of the quadratic equation $(k^2)^2 - (2e^2 \rho_0^2 + m_G^2)k^2 + e^4 \rho_0^4 = 0$. In the above equation, the gauge-boson's degree of freedom has been continued to $n-3$ in order to preserve the relevant Ward identities. Our expression of $V_{1-loop}(\rho_0)$ agree with previous results obtained in the unitary gauge¹⁵. One could also calculate the effective potential in the *ghost-free* covariant gauges with $L_{gf} = -\frac{1}{2\xi}(\partial_\mu B^\mu)^2$. The cancellation of gauge-parameter dependence in the effective potential has been demonstrated in the case of massless scalar-QED with $\mu^2 = 0$ ^{14,10}. It can be easily extended to the massive case.

It is instructive to rewrite Eq. (14) as

$$V_{1-loop}(\rho_0) = \frac{\hbar}{2} \int \frac{d^{n-1} \vec{k}}{(2\pi)^{n-1}} \left((n-3)\omega_B(\vec{k}) + \omega_H(\vec{k}) + \omega_+(\vec{k}) + \omega_-(\vec{k}) \right), \quad (15)$$

where $\omega_B(\vec{k}) = \sqrt{\vec{k}^2 + e^2 \rho_0^2}$, $\omega_H(\vec{k}) = \sqrt{\vec{k}^2 + m_H^2}$ and $\omega_\pm(\vec{k}) = \sqrt{\vec{k}^2 + m_\pm^2}$. One can see that V_{1-loop} is a sum of the zero-point energies of four excitations with masses $m_B \equiv e\rho_0$, m_H , m_+ and m_- . Since there are precisely four physical degrees of freedom in scalar QED, we see that Vilkovisky-DeWitt effective potential does exhibit a correct number of physical degrees of freedom.

3 Vilkovisky-DeWitt Effective Potential of the Simplified Standard Model

In this section, we compute the effective potential of the simplified standard model where charged boson fields and all fermion fields except the top quark field are discarded. The gauge interactions of this model are prescribed by the following covariant derivatives¹³:

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu t_L &= (\partial_\mu + ig_L Z_\mu - \frac{2}{3}ieA_\mu)t_L, \\ D_\mu t_R &= (\partial_\mu + ig_R Z_\mu - \frac{2}{3}ieA_\mu)t_R, \\ D_\mu \phi &= (\partial_\mu + i(g_L - g_R)Z_\mu)\phi, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $g_L = (-g_1/2 + g_2/3)$, $g_R = g_2/3$ with $g_1 = g/\cos\theta_W$ and $g_2 = 2e\tan\theta_W$. Clearly this toy model

exhibits a $U(1)_A \times U(1)_Z$ symmetry where each $U(1)$ symmetry is associated with a neutral gauge boson. The $U(1)_Z$ -charges of t_L , t_R and ϕ are related in such a way that the following Yukawa interactions are invariant under $U(1)_A \times U(1)_Z$:

$$L_Y = -y\bar{t}_L \phi t_R - y\bar{t}_R \phi^* t_L. \quad (17)$$

Since Vilkovisky-DeWitt effective action coincides with ordinary effective action calculated in the Landau-DeWitt gauge, we hence calculate the effective potential in this gauge which has

$$\begin{aligned} L_{gf} &= -\frac{1}{2\alpha}(\partial_\mu Z^\mu + \frac{ig_1}{2}\eta^\dagger \Phi - \frac{ig_1}{2}\Phi^\dagger \eta)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\beta}(\partial_\mu A^\mu)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

with $\alpha, \beta \rightarrow 0$. We note that A^μ and Z^μ are quantum fluctuations associated with the photon and the Z boson. Their classical backgrounds can be set to zero for computing the effective potential. Following the method of the previous section, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_{VD}(\rho_0) &= \frac{\hbar}{2} \int \frac{d^{n-1} \vec{k}}{(2\pi)^{n-1}} \left((n-3)\omega_Z(\vec{k}) + \omega_H(\vec{k}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \omega_+(\vec{k}) + \omega_-(\vec{k}) - 4\omega_F(\vec{k}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

with $\omega_i(\vec{k}) = \sqrt{\vec{k}^2 + m_i^2}$ where $m_Z^2 = \frac{g_1^2}{4}\rho_0^2$, $m_\pm^2 = m_Z^2 + \frac{1}{2}(m_G^2 \pm m_G \sqrt{m_G^2 + 4m_Z^2})$ and $m_t^2 \equiv m_i^2 = \frac{y^2 \rho_0^2}{2}$. Performing the integration in Eq. (19) and subtracting the infinities with $\overline{MS}$ prescription, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_{VD}(\rho_0) &= \frac{1}{64\pi^2} (m_H^4 \ln \frac{m_H^2}{\kappa^2} + m_Z^4 \ln \frac{m_Z^2}{\kappa^2} \\ &\quad + m_+^4 \ln \frac{m_+^2}{\kappa^2} + m_-^4 \ln \frac{m_-^2}{\kappa^2} - 4m_t^4 \ln \frac{m_t^2}{\kappa^2}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{128\pi^2} (3m_H^4 + 5m_Z^4 + 3m_G^4 \\ &\quad + 12m_G^2 m_Z^2 - 12m_t^4). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Although $V_{VD}(\rho_0)$ is obtained in the Landau-DeWitt gauge, we should stress that any other gauge with non-vanishing T_{jk}^i should lead to the same result. For later comparisons, let us write down the ordinary effective potential in the *ghost-free* Landau gauge² (equivalent to removing the scalar part of Eq. (18)):

$$\begin{aligned} V_L(\rho_0) &= \frac{\hbar}{2} \int \frac{d^{n-1} \vec{k}}{(2\pi)^{n-1}} \left((n-1)\omega_Z(\vec{k}) + \omega_H(\vec{k}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \omega_G(\vec{k}) - 4\omega_F(\vec{k}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Performing the integrations in V_L and subtracting the infinities give

$$V_L(\rho_0) = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} (m_H^4 \ln \frac{m_H^2}{\kappa^2} + 3m_Z^4 \ln \frac{m_Z^2}{\kappa^2}$$

$$+ m_G^4 \ln \frac{m_G^2}{\kappa^2} - 4m_t^4 \ln \frac{m_t^2}{\kappa^2}) \\ - \frac{1}{128\pi^2} (3m_H^4 + 5m_Z^4 + 3m_G^4 - 12m_t^4). \quad (22)$$

We remark that V_L differs from V_{VD} except at the point of extremum where $\rho_0^2 = 2\mu^2$. At this point, one has $m_G^2 = 0$ and $m_\pm^2 = m_Z^2$ which leads to $V_{VD}(\rho_0 = 2\mu^2) = V_L(\rho_0^2 = 2\mu^2)$. That $V_{VD} = V_L$ at the point of extremum is a consequence of Nielsen identities³.

To derive the Higgs mass bound from $V_{VD}(\rho_0)$ or $V_L(\rho_0)$, one encounters a breakdown of the perturbation theory at, for instance, $\frac{\lambda}{16\pi^2} \ln \frac{\lambda\rho_0^2}{\kappa^2} > 1$ for a large ρ_0 . To extend the validity of the effective potential for a large ρ_0 , the effective potential has to be improved by the renormalization group(RG) analysis. Let us denote the effective potential generically as V_{eff} . The renormalization-scale independence of V_{eff} implies the following equation^{18,4}:

$$\left(-\mu(\gamma_\mu + 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \beta_{\hat{g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{g}} \right. \\ \left. - (\gamma_\rho + 1)t \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + 4 \right) V_{eff}(t\rho_0^i, \mu, \hat{g}, \kappa) = 0. \quad (23)$$

where $\hat{g}$ denotes collectively the coupling constants λ, g_1, g_2 and y ; ρ_0^i is an arbitrarily chosen initial value for ρ_0 . Solving this differential equation gives

$$V_{eff}(t\rho_0^i, \mu_i, \hat{g}_i, \kappa) = \exp \left(\int_0^{\ln t} \frac{4}{1 + \gamma_\rho(x)} dx \right) \\ \times V_{eff}(\rho_0^i, \mu(t, \mu_i), \hat{g}(t, \hat{g}_i), \kappa), \quad (24)$$

where

$$t \frac{d\hat{g}}{dt} = \frac{\beta_{\hat{g}}(\hat{g}(t))}{1 + \gamma_\rho(\hat{g}(t))} \text{ with } \hat{g}(0) = \hat{g}_i, \quad (25)$$

and

$$\mu(t, \mu_i) = \mu_i \exp \left(- \int_0^{\ln t} \frac{1 + \gamma_\mu(x)}{1 + \gamma_\rho(x)} dx \right) \quad (26)$$

To fully determine V_{eff} at large ρ_0 , we need to calculate β functions of λ, g_1, g_2 and y , and the anomalous dimensions γ_μ and γ_ρ . It has been demonstrated that the n -loop effective potential is improved by $(n+1)$ -loop β and γ functions^{19,20}. Since the effective potential is calculated to the one-loop order, a consistent RG analysis requires the knowledge of β and γ functions up to two loops. As the computation of two-loop β and γ functions are quite involved, we will simply improve the tree-level effective potential with one-loop β and γ functions.

We have the following one-loop β and γ functions in the Landau-DeWitt gauge (we will set $\hbar = 1$ from this point on):

$$\beta_\lambda = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \left(\frac{3}{8}g_1^4 - 3\lambda g_1^2 - 2y^4 + 4\lambda y^2 + 20\lambda^2 \right),$$

$$\beta_{g_1} = \frac{g_1}{4\pi^2} \left(\frac{g_1^2}{16} - \frac{g_1 g_2}{18} + \frac{g_2^2}{27} \right), \\ \beta_{g_2} = \frac{g_2}{4\pi^2} \left(\frac{g_1^2}{16} - \frac{g_1 g_2}{18} + \frac{g_2^2}{27} \right), \\ \beta_y = \frac{y}{8\pi^2} \left(y^2 - \frac{3g_1^2}{8} + \frac{g_1 g_2}{12} \right), \\ \gamma_\mu = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \left(\frac{3\lambda}{4} + \frac{3g_1^4}{128} - \frac{3g_1^2}{32} - \frac{y^4}{8\lambda} + \frac{y^2}{8} \right), \\ \gamma_\rho = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} (-5g_1^2 + 4y^2). \quad (27)$$

We stress that all the above functions except γ_ρ , the anomalous dimension of the scalar field, are in fact gauge-independent in the $\overline{MS}$ subtraction scheme. For γ_ρ in the Landau gauge, we have

$$\gamma_\rho = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} (-3g_1^2 + 4y^2). \quad (28)$$

4 The Higgs Mass Bound

The lower bound of the Higgs mass can be derived from the vacuum instability condition for the effective potential. To derive the mass bound, one begins with Eq. (24) which implies

$$V_{tree}(t\rho_0^i, \mu_i, \lambda_i) = \frac{1}{4} \chi(t) \lambda(t, \lambda_i) ((\rho_0^i)^2 - 2\mu^2(t, \mu_i))^2, \quad (29)$$

with $\chi(t) = \exp \left(\int_0^{\ln t} \frac{4}{1 + \gamma_\rho(x)} dx \right)$. Since $\mu(t, \mu_i)$ decreases as t increases, we have $V_{tree}(t\rho_0^i, \mu_i, \lambda_i) \approx \frac{1}{4} \chi(t) \lambda(t, \lambda_i) (\rho_0^i)^4$ for a sufficiently large t . Similarly, the one-loop effective potential $V_{1-loop}(t\rho_0^i, \mu_i, \hat{g}_i, \kappa)$ is also proportional to $V_{1-loop}(\rho_0^i, \mu(t, \mu_i), \hat{g}(t, \hat{g}_i), \kappa)$ with the same proportional constant $\chi(t)$ as in V_{tree} . Since we shall neglect all running effects in V_{1-loop} , we have $\hat{g}(t, \hat{g}_i) = \hat{g}_i$ and $\mu(t, \mu_i) = \frac{1}{t} \mu_i$ in V_{1-loop} . For a sufficiently large t , we can again approximate V_{1-loop} by its quartic terms. In the Landau-DeWitt gauge with the choice $\rho_0^i = \kappa$, we have

$$V_{VD} \approx \frac{(\rho_0^i)^4}{64\pi^2} \left[9\lambda_i^2 \ln(3\lambda_i) + \frac{g_{1i}^4}{16} \ln\left(\frac{g_{1i}^2}{4}\right) - y_i^4 \ln\left(\frac{y_i^2}{2}\right) \right. \\ \left. + A_+^2(g_{1i}, \lambda_i) \ln A_+(g_{1i}, \lambda_i) \right. \\ \left. + A_-^2(g_{1i}, \lambda_i) \ln A_-(g_{1i}, \lambda_i) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{3}{2}(10\lambda_i^2 + \lambda_i g_{1i}^2 + \frac{5}{48}g_{1i}^4 - y_i^4) \right], \quad (30)$$

where $A_\pm(g_1, \lambda) = g_1^2/4 + \lambda/2 \cdot (1 \pm \sqrt{1 + g_1^2/\lambda})$. Similarly, the effective potential in the Landau gauge reads:

$$V_L \approx \frac{(\rho_0^i)^4}{64\pi^2} \left[9\lambda_i^2 \ln(3\lambda_i) + \frac{3g_{1i}^4}{16} \ln\left(\frac{g_{1i}^2}{4}\right) - y_i^4 \ln\left(\frac{y_i^2}{2}\right) \right. \\ \left. + \lambda_i^2 \ln(\lambda_i) - \frac{3}{2}(10\lambda_i^2 + \lambda_i g_{1i}^2 + \frac{5}{48}g_{1i}^4 - y_i^4) \right], \quad (31)$$

Combining the tree level and the one-loop effective potential, we arrive at

$$V_{eff}(t\rho_0^i, \mu_i, \hat{g}_i, \kappa) \approx \frac{1}{4}\chi(t)(\lambda(t, \lambda_i) + \Delta\lambda(\hat{g}_i))(\rho_0^i)^4, \quad (32)$$

where $\Delta\lambda$ denotes one-loop corrections given by Eqs. (30) or (31). Let $t_{VI} = \rho_{VI}/\rho_0^i$. The condition for vacuum instability of the effective potential is then²¹

$$\lambda(t_{VI}, \lambda_i) + \Delta\lambda(\hat{g}_i) = 0. \quad (33)$$

We note that couplings $\hat{g}_i$ in $\Delta\lambda$ is evaluated at $\kappa = \rho_0^i$, which can be taken as the electroweak scale. Hence $g_{1i} \equiv g/\cos\theta_W = 0.67$, $g_{2i} \equiv 2e\tan\theta_W = 0.31$, and $y_i = 1$. The running coupling $\lambda(t_{VI}, \lambda_i)$ also depends on g_1 , g_2 and y through β_λ , and γ_ρ shown in Eq. (27).

The strategy for solving Eq. (33) is to make an initial guess on λ_i , which enters into $\lambda(t)$ and $\Delta\lambda$, and repeatedly adjusting λ_i till $\lambda(t)$ completely cancels $\Delta\lambda$. For $t_{VI} = 10^2$ (or $\rho_0 \approx 10^4$ GeV) which is the new-physics scale reachable by LHC, we find $\lambda_i = 4.83 \times 10^{-2}$ for Landau-DeWitt gauge, and $\lambda_i = 4.8 \times 10^{-2}$ for Landau gauge. For a higher instability scale such as the scale of grand unification, we have $t_{VI} = 10^{13}$ or $\rho_0 \approx 10^{15}$ GeV. In this case, we find $\lambda_i = 3.13 \times 10^{-1}$ for both Landau-DeWitt and Landau gauges. The numerical agreement between λ_i 's of two gauges can be attributed to an identical β function for the running of $\lambda(t)$, and a small difference in $\Delta\lambda$ between two gauges. We recall from Eq. (25) that the evolution of λ in two gauges will be different if effects of next-to-leading logarithm are taken into account. In that case, the difference in γ_ρ between two gauges give rise to different evolutions for λ . One may expect to see non-negligible differences in λ_i between two gauges for a large t_{VI} .

The critical value $\lambda_i = 4.83 \times 10^{-2}$ corresponds to a lower bound for the $\overline{MS}$ mass of the Higgs boson. Since $m_H = 2\sqrt{\lambda}\mu$, we have $(m_H)_{\overline{MS}} \geq 77$ GeV. For $\lambda_i = 3.13 \times 10^{-1}$, we have $(m_H)_{\overline{MS}} \geq 196$ GeV. To obtain the lower bound for the physical mass of the Higgs boson, finite radiative corrections must be added to the above bounds¹¹. We will not pursue any further on these finite corrections since we are simply dealing with a toy model. However we like to point out that this finite correction is gauge-independent as ensured by Nielsen identities³.

5 Conclusion

We have computed the one-loop effective potential of an abelian $U(1) \times U(1)$ model in the Landau-DeWitt gauge, which reproduces the result given by the gauge-independent Vilkovisky-DeWitt formalism. One-loop β and γ functions are also computed to facilitate the

RG improvement of the effective potential. A gauge-independent lower bound for the Higgs self-coupling or equivalently the $\overline{MS}$ mass of the Higgs boson is derived. We compare this bound to that obtained by the ordinary effective potential computed in Landau gauge. The numerical values of both bounds are almost identical due to the leading-logarithmic approximation we have taken. A complete next-to-leading analysis as well as an extension of this work to the full standard model will be reported in future publications.

Acknowledgements

We thank W.-F. Kao for discussions. This work is supported in part by National Science Council of R.O.C. under grant numbers NSC 87-2112-M-009-038, and NSC 88-2112-M-009-002.

References

1. R. Jackiw, *Phys. Rev. D* **9**, 1686 (1974).
2. L. Dolan and R. Jackiw, *Phys. Rev. D* **9**, 2904 (1974).
3. N. K. Nielsen, *Nucl. Phys. B* **101**, 173 (1975).
4. D. Boyanovsky, W. Loinaz and R. S. Willey, *Phys. Rev. D* **57**, 100 (1998).
5. D. Boyanovsky, D. Brahm, R. Holman and D.-S. Lee, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 1763 (1996).
6. G.-L. Lin and T.-K. Chyi, NCTU-HEP-9804, hep-ph/9811213.
7. G. Vilkovisky, "The Gospel According to DeWitt" in *Quantum Theory of Gravity*, ed. S. M. Christensen (Adam Hilger, Bristol, 1983); *Nucl. Phys. B* **234**, 215 (1984).
8. See, for example, B. S. DeWitt in *Quantum Field Theory and Quantum Statistics: Essays in Honour of the 60th Birthday of E. S. Fradkin*, eds. I. A. Batalin, C. J. Isham and G. A. Vilkovisky (Hilger, Bristol, 1987), p. 191.
9. A mere replacement of $-\eta^i$ with $\sigma^i(\Phi, \phi)$, as suggested in Ref⁷, is not satisfactory for calculations beyond one-loop, because $\Gamma[\Phi]$ does not generate one-particle irreducible diagrams at the higher loops. A modified construction was given by DeWitt in Ref⁸. Since we will be only concerned with one-loop corrections, we shall adhere to the current construction in our subsequent discussions.
10. See, for example, G. Kunstatter, in *Super Field Theories*, eds. H. C. Lee, V. Elias, G. Kunstatter, R. B. Mann, and K. S. Viswanathan (Plenum, New York, 1987), p. 503.
11. W. Loinaz and R. S. Willey, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 7416 (1997).

12. A. Rehban, *Nucl. Phys. B* **288**, 832 (1987); *Nucl. Phys. B* **298**, 726 (1988).
13. G.-L. Lin, H. Steger and Y.-P. Yao, *Phys. Rev. D* **44**, 2139 (1991).
14. E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, *Nucl. Phys. B* **234**, 509 (1984).
15. I. H. Russell and D. J. Toms, *Phys. Rev. D* **39**, 1735 (1989).
16. Although properties of this gauge are discussed in Ref.¹⁴, authors of this paper used other gauge to calculate the effective potential of scalar QED.
17. In the current gauge, $\tilde{D}_{ij}^{-1} = D_{ij}^{-1}$ since Γ_{jk}^i vanishes. Furthermore, for ghost fields, it is the ghost propagator rather than its inverse that will appear in the effective action. This is due to the Grassmannian nature of ghost fields.
18. S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. D* **7**, 1888 (1973).
19. B. Kastening, *Phys. Lett. B* **283**, 287 (1992).
20. M. Bando, T. Kugo, N. Maekawa and H. Nakano, *Phys. Lett. B* **301**, 83 (1993).
21. J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa and M. Quiros, *Phys. Lett. B* **342**, 171 (1995).